

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 22 is respectfully requested. No basis for the rejection was ever put forward and, therefore, it is very difficult to respond. However, the resistances R5 and R6 are not coupled as a voltage divider. Moreover, the proposition that because of the resistance of R4 in a different embodiment something can be deduced about the resistances of R5 and R6 should be reconsidered. It is not seen how there is any basis for such an assertion.

With respect to claim 23, the claim calls for coupling the gate of a transistor to a node between the first and second resistances. This limitation does not appear to be addressed. The transistor is asserted to be the transistor 74 and it does not appear that the gate of the transistor 74 is coupled to a node between the first and second resistances, if those are asserted to be R5 and R6. There is a node that is coupled to one end of the resistor R6, but there would appear to be no basis to suggest that node is between both of the resistances R5 and R6.

Claim 12 calls for the resistances coupled as a voltage divider. This limitation was not addressed and, therefore, it is difficult to respond to. But there appears to be no basis for any assertion that Figure 10 of the reference teaches such an arrangement. The same can be said with respect to claim 17.

The objection to "in series" has been noted and the limitation has been canceled.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 15, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation